

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1-9 and 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) over the patent to Savage.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) over the patent to Savage.

Also, the specification and the claims are objected to.

In connection with the Examiner's formal objections to the specification and the claims, the specification and the claims have been amended. It is believed that the grounds for the formal objections are therefore eliminated.

In connection with the Examiner's rejection of the claims over the art, in particular over the patent to Savage, et al, applicant wishes to make the following remarks.

Claim 13 defines a device for securing an add-on part to a substantially smooth drive shaft having a slaving element which is seated in a manner fixed against relative rotation on the drive shaft and transmits a rotary motion from the drive shaft to the add-on part. Furthermore, claim 13 defines a spring element which axially fixes the add-on part on the drive shaft.

In the invention it is proposed that the slaving element 14 penetrates the add-on part 10, and the spring element 16 is braced on the slaving element 14 and on the add-on part 10 so as to axially fix the add-on part 10.

The device in accordance with the present invention as defined in claim 13 is not disclosed in the patent to Savage, et al.

Contrary to the device in accordance with the present invention as defined in claim 13, the spring element 46 of the device disclosed in the patent to Savage, et al is clamped between the slaving element 28 and the shoulder 48 of a nut 42 which is additionally screwed on the shaft or the nut assembly 44. In particular, in column 2, line 64 to column 3, line 11 of the patent to Savage the following is stated:

"The Belleville spring 46 is in its undeflected state a coned metallic spring member as indicated by phantom lines in Figure 1. This spring is mounted for free spinning on the nut and has a central opening coaxial with the threaded opening in the nut that receives the cylindrical shoulder 48 on the nut. The spring 46 is retained on the shoulder by radially upsetting or coining the outer end of the shoulder as indicated at 50. When the assembly 44 is installed on the threaded end of shaft 34, the spring 46 is disposed against the outer face of the hub portion of the fan. When the nut 42 is tightened to a predetermined torque, the spring 46 will flatten as shown in solid lines in Figure 1 thereby appraising the installer that a proper and predetermined compression load has been applied to the fan assembly".

The design of the slaving element 14 in accordance with the present invention makes completely superfluous the use of an additional screw 42 arranged on the shaft. It is therefore believed to be clear that the teaching which a person skilled in the art can derive from the patent to Savage would lead him away from the applicant's invention and undoubtedly can not be considered as pertinent to the applicant's invention for making the present invention obvious. It can be clearly seen from Figure 1 of the patent to Savage that the spring element 46 is not clamped between the slaving

NOT CLAIMED

element and the add-on part, but instead is located between the insert 14a and a shoulder 48 or 50 of the counter nut 42.

In view of the above presented arguments, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 defines a device which should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the device disclosed in the patent Savage, and therefore this claim should be considered as allowable.

Claims 14-21 and 23, 24 depend on claim 13, they share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that they should be allowed as well.

The Examiner indicated that claim 10 should also be considered as unpatentable over the patent to Savage in the sense of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). First of all claim 10 which is now claim 22 depends on claim 13 and shares its presumably allowable features, and therefore it should be allowed even for these reasons.

On the other hand, as can be clearly derived from Figure 2 of the patent to Savage, the pin 22 of the add-on part 10 engages in a corresponding recess 24 of the slaving element 26 and serves for

transmission of torque from the drive shaft 34 through the slaving element 26 to the add-on part 10. The pin 22 has no functions or operational capabilities for the spring element 46 of the device disclosed in the patent to Savage. The pin 22 disclosed in the patent to Savage corresponds to the pins 24, 26, 28 of the device in the applicant's invention, which engage in corresponding aligned openings 30, 32, 34 at the inner side 36 of the add-on part 10 and therefore transmit the rotary motion of the slaving element 14 to the add-on part 10, as shown for example in Figures 1 and 2 of the present application.

From consideration of the patent to Savage, et al a person of ordinary skill in the art would not obtain any hint or suggestion that the spring element 26 can be secured by a positioning pin on the add-on part against undesirable rotation. Moreover, the spring element 46 in accordance with the teaching of the patent to Savage, et al is clamped between the add-on part 10 and the nut 42 and prevents in this way a rotation of the spring 46.

It is believed that claim 10 which is now claim 22 should be considered as patentably distinguishing the present invention from the prior art not only because it depends on the presumably allowable claim 13, but also because it contains a patentable subject matter per se.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27233